

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary

Application No.

09/918,365

Applicant(s)

MICHAL ET AL.

Examiner

Jennifer K. Michener

Art Unit

1762

All Participants:

(1) Jennifer K. Michener.

(2) Chuck Runyan.

Status of Application: Response to non-final filed.
Final rejection made herein.

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 22 July 2004

Time: ~2PM

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

N/A

Claims discussed:

1, 13, 34-38

Prior art documents discussed:

N/A

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner phoned Applicant's representative to clarify an issue with the election of species requirement. Prior to the first office action, Applicant elected the species of unfractionated heparin from the four species of unfractionated heparin, desulfated heparin (both of these first two present in dependent claim 13), benzalkonium heparin, and TDMA-heparin (both of these second two species being surfactant-bound-type heparins, present in dependent claim 36). In the first action, Examiner withdrew from consideration the desulfated heparin of claim 13 and the surfactant-bound heparins of claims 35-38, along with the other non-elected groups. Claims 1-18 and 34 were examined in the first action, including independent claims 1, 15, and 34. In response to the first office action, Applicant included the limitation of "surfactant-bound" in independent claims 1 and 34. Examiner believed that this represented a shift to non-elected species (benzalkonium and TDMA), however she wished to be sure that the phrase "surfactant-bound" did not generically encompass all four species. Examiner called Applicant's representative for clarification. Mr Runyan indicated that "surfactant-bound" was not a generic term which could encompass all four species and that the phrase therefore did represent an inadvertent shift to a non-elected species. .